

## **REMARKS**

Please reconsider the present application in view of the following remarks. Applicant thanks Examiner for carefully considering the present application.

Claims 1-12 and 14-36 are currently pending. By way of this reply, no claim is amended, canceled, or added.

### **Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(e) in View of Doganata**

In the 5th paragraph of the Final Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 8-10, 17-19, and 24-26 under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0220913 to Doganata et al. (“Doganata”). For the reasons set forth below, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” See *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987); MPEP § 2131. Independent claim 1 recites a method that includes determining whether a received search query has been previously received and, if so, determining whether at least a portion of a previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query. If the portion of the previously stored result set is determined to be valid, the method outputs it as a search result of the search query. Therefore, the method can output a result set for a search query without generating a new result set. Independent claims 17 and 34 include limitations similar to claim 1.

Doganata, among other differences, fails to disclose the claimed limitation of “determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query” and “if the at least a portion of

the previously stored result set associated with the search query is determined to be a valid search result set for the search query, outputting the portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query as a search result of the search query.” Doganata, in contrast, discloses techniques for automatically selecting information sources that are most relevant to user queries. See Doganata, Abstract. The Doganata system allows a user query to be categorized into a number of categories, where each category is associated with a ranked list of information sources. See Doganata, paragraph [0020]. Therefore, Doganata’s system identifies a category for a user query and uses a ranked list of information sources associated with the category to search for and rank the result of the user query, rather than determining whether at least a portion of a previously stored result set associated with a search query is a valid search result, and if so returning the portion as a search result of the search query, as recited in the independent claims 1, 17 and 34.

Doganata does not disclose the claimed element of “determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query.” Examiner cited paragraphs [0023], [0024], and [0039] of Doganata for this element. However, the cited paragraphs only disclose a system that ranks information sources associated with a category and searches first in the high-ranking information sources of the category for user queries. For example, “queries may be generated automatically from the keywords that represent a category to determine the rank of an information source,” “If these information sources are searched first, then the results placed highest in a list of returned documents will generally be more pertinent than the results obtained by the metasearch system.” See Doganata, paragraphs [0023] and [0024]. Therefore, the cited paragraphs teach using queries to rank information sources and

conducting searches first in high-ranking information sources for fast return of relevant documents. Doganata does not hint or suggest of determining whether at least a portion of a previously stored result set associated with a search query is a valid search result set for the search query.

Examiner asserted that “by ranking of the results according their relevance and returning a higher percentage of relevant documents, the method of Doganata is essentially determining how large a portion of a category of searched results are relevant to the query.” Therefore, the method is determining whether a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid result set for the search query.” See the Final Office Action, pages 4-5 (Emphasis added). Applicant respectfully disagrees. “How large a portion of a category of searched results are relevant to [a search] query” is different from “whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query.” “A category of searched results” do not need to be associated with the search query and do not need to be previously stored, and thus are different from “the previously stored result set associated with the search query.” Because invalid search results can be relevant to a search query, determining how a search result is relevant to a query is different from determining whether a search result is a valid result for the query. Also, Doganata only discloses a category with ranked information sources, and not “a category of searched results,” as Examiner asserts.

Doganata also does not disclose the claimed element of “if the at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is determined to be a valid search result set for the search query, outputting the portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query as a search result of the search query.” Examiner cited

paragraph [0046] of Doganata for this element. However, the cited paragraph only teaches ranking information sources and updating the associated category, which is different from the above cited claim element. Therefore, Doganata fails to disclose the above cited feature as required by independent claims 1, 17 and 34.

In view of the above, Doganata fails to disclose each and every limitation recited in independent claims 1, 17 and 34. Thus, independent claims 1, 17 and 34 are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102 rejections is respectfully requested.

**Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Doganata and Baidya**

In the 8th paragraph of the Final Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 4-7, 11, 14, 15, 20-23, 27, 30, and 31 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Doganata and U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0046311 to Baidya et al. (“Baidya”). For the reasons set forth below, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Doganata fails to disclose each and every limitation of independent claims 1, 17 and 34. Baidya similarly fails. Baidya discloses a system that crawls the Internet for web sites, extracts URLs from web sites, categorizes the web sites and URLs, and conducts user search queries that search a subset of the web sites and URLs based on the category information. See Baidya, Abstract Summary, paragraphs [0013], [0019] and [0020]. Baidya is all-together silent as to determining whether at least a portion of a previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query, and if so returning the portion as a search result of the search query, as required

by the claimed invention. Accordingly, Baidya fails to at least disclose these limitations of independent claims 1, 17 and 34 not disclosed or taught in Doganata.

In view of the above, Doganata and Baidya, whether considered singly or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in independent claims 1, 17 and 34. Thus, independent claims 1, 17 and 34 are patentable over Doganata and Baidya. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

**Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Doganata, Baidya and Denny**

In the 9th paragraph of the Final Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 29 and 34-36 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Doganata in view of Baidya and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,082,428 to Denny et al. (“Denny”). For the reasons set forth below, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Doganata and Baidya fail to disclose each and every limitation of independent claims 1, 17 and 34. Denny similarly fails. Denny discloses a system and method for collaborative searching. Denny’s system receives search queries in a query server, which stores previously executed queries and corresponding results in a database. Subsequent search queries are compared to the stored queries in the query server. If a stored query is substantially similar to a subsequent query, Denny’s system returns to the user the result corresponding to the stored query as the search result of the subsequent query. See Denny, col. 2, lines 3-11. Denny is all-together silent as to determining whether at least a portion of a previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query, and if so returning the portion as a search result of the search

query, as required by the claimed invention, as required by the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Denny fails to disclose at least one limitation of independent claims 1, 17 and 34 not disclosed or taught in Doganata and Baidya.

In view of the above, Doganata, Baidya and Denny, whether considered singly or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in independent claims 1, 17 and 34. Thus, independent claims 1, 17 and 34 are patentable over Doganata, Baidya and Denny. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

**Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Doganata, Baidya and Rivers**

In the 10th paragraph of the Final Office Action, Examiner rejects claim 33 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Doganata in view of Baidya and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0267813 to Rivers-Moore et al. ("Rivers"). For the reasons set forth below, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Doganata and Baidya fail to disclose each and every limitation of independent claim 1. Rivers similarly fails. Rivers discloses a solution for a data file that enables a user to interact with data in the data file. See Rivers, Summary. The solutions are downloaded and stored locally. When a solution is needed, a unique special name for the solution identifier is computed to determine whether the solution is stored locally. If the solution is stored locally and up-to-date, Rivers's system uses the local solution, otherwise it downloads the solution from online. See Rivers, paragraphs [0079-0105], and Fig. 7. Rivers is all-together silent as to determining whether at least a portion of a previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query, and if so

returning the portion as a search result of the search query, as required by the claimed invention. Accordingly, Rivers fails to at least disclose those limitations of independent claim 1 not disclosed or taught in Doganata and Baidya.

In view of the above, Doganata, Baidya and Rivers, whether considered singly or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 is patentable over Doganata and Baidya. Dependent claim 33 is allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

**Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Doganata, Baidya, Denny and Shaath**

In the 11th paragraph of the Final Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 12, 16, 28 and 32 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Doganata in view of Baidya and further in view of Denny and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 20060010150 to Shaath et al. ("Shaath"). For the reasons set forth below, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Doganata, Baidya and Denny fail to disclose each and every limitation of independent claims 1, 17 and 34. Shaath similarly fails. Shaath discloses a method and system for managing a file, including determining an expiration date and a minimum lifespan for the file, and deleting the file when expired. See Shaath, paragraphs [0102-0104], and Fig. 6. Shaath is all-together silent as to determining whether at least a portion of a previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query, and if so returning the portion as a search result of the search

query, as required by the claimed invention. Accordingly, Shaath fails to at least disclose those limitations of independent claims 1, 17 and 34 not disclosed or taught in Doganata, Baidya and Denny.

In view of the above, Doganata, Baidya, Denny and Shaath, whether considered singly or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in independent claims 1, 17 and 34. Thus, independent claims 1, 17 and 34 are patentable over Doganata, Baidya, Denny and Shaath. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully requested.



### **Conclusion**

In sum, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-12 and 14-36, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and requests allowance of them.

In addition, Applicant respectfully invites Examiner to contact Applicant's representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Mihai Florin Ionescu

Date: June 7, 2007

By: /Jie Zhang/

Jie Zhang, Reg. No. 60,242  
Attorney for Applicant  
Fenwick & West LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Tel.: (650) 335-7297  
Fax: (650) 938-5200